

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,839	11/28/2005	Helmuth Eggers	3926.163	5022
30448 7590 01/09/2008 AKERMAN SENTERFITT P.O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			EXAMINER	
			CROSLAND, DONNIE L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2612	
			·	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/539,839	EGGERS ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	DONNIE L. CROSLAND	2612
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicati - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC, CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI statute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this communication. INDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b) Since this application is in condition for a closed in accordance with the practice ur	This action is non-final. Ilowance except for formal matte	·
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are pending in the applic 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are wi 5)□ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-15</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	thdrawn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exa 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the company of the control of the contro	☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to b to the drawing(s) be held in abeyand correction is required if the drawing(s	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E * See the attached detailed Office action for	iments have been received. Iments have been received in Ap e priority documents have been r Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No eceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		/Mail Date formal Patent Application

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. These claims would require specific circuitry and elements to achieve the desired result.

The specific manner in which the evaluation area and the tolerance area are automatically expanded when an object recognized is located only partially in the evaluation area are achieved are not readily apparent to the skilled artisan.

It would appear that specific circuitry which is not disclosed nor shown is necessary for carrying out the automatic expanding function.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-8 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abel et al.

Abel shows the method and apparatus for detecting surroundings by means of an automotive night vision system.

Abel provides for high beam and low beam areas of monitoring, col. 3, lines 13-25.

Abel does not state that an area of representation comprises at most the high beam area of the vehicle.

Abel clearly provides for high beam area monitoring as stated above.

Abel clearly states that the light source 9 serves to illuminate a visual field 10 in front of the vehicle, col. 3, lines 17 and 18.

Abel states that the night vision device 20 can be additionally switched on to enlarge the visual field 10, the depth of the visual 10 is extended extend, col. 3, lines 19-25.

Accordingly, the claimed "area of representation comprises at most the high beam area of the vehicle" is obvious over the high beam area of illumination in Abel which may include most of the high beam area, due to such extension

With respect to claim 2, see evaluation area 10.

With respect to claim 3, "a tolerance area adjoins the area of representation" is analogous to the visual field 10 being enlarged and thus extending the area of representation. The extension of area 10 is analogous to the tolerance area.

With respect to claims 4 and 5, see high beam and low beam in col. 3, lines 13-18.

With respect to claims 6-8, see optical representation such as display of visual field by display 3.

The added limitation of "restricting the area to comprise at most the high beam area of the vehicle" is not patentably significant since Abel teaches the artisan to form a desired radiation distribution, see col. 3, 1-12, and claims 13, 19, and 21.

Application/Control Number:

10/539,839 Art Unit: 2612

The Fresnel lens and bifocal lens provides for focusing the infrared radiation to form a desired radiation distribution, see claim 13.

Accordingly, the artisan recognizes that the desired radiation distribution is clearly analogous to the claimed "restricting the area of representation".

Accordingly, it is submitted that Abel's desired radiation distribution may include the high beam area, the low beam area, or any desired area of interest.

Adjustment of the optical radiation to a specified area would not involve patentable invention since it is within the capabilities of the skilled artisan to as evidenced in the teachings Abel to adjust such optical radiation.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10-24-07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The artisan recognizes that Abel's desired radiation distribution may include the visual field 10 as represented by the low or high beam headlight, see col. 3, lines 1-25.

The restricting step in Abel is performed by the creation of the desired radiation distribution with respect to the lens 6 and 7.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DONNIE L. CROSLAND whose telephone number is 571-272-2980. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur. 9:30a-6:00p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DANIEL J. WU can be reached on 571-272-2964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1900.

DONNE L. CROSLAND Primary Examiner Application/Control Number: 10/539,839

Art Unit: 2612

1-4-07